arXiv:1402.6793v2 [math.OC] 28 Feb 2014

A Stochastic Maximum Principle for Processes Driven by G-Brownian Motion and Applications to Finance

Zhongyang Sun[*] Xin Zhang[†] Junyi Guo[‡]

Abstract: In this paper, we consider the stochastic optimal control problems under model risk caused by uncertain volatilities. To have a mathematical consistent framework we use the notion of G-expectation and its corresponding G-Brwonian motion introduced by Peng [23]. Based on the theory of stochastic differential equations on a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{\mathbb{E}})$, we prove a stochastic maximum principle for controlled processes driven by G-Brownian motion. Then we obtain the maximum condition in terms of the $\mathcal{H}$-function plus some convexity conditions constitute sufficient conditions for optimality. Finally, we solve a portfolio optimization problem with ambiguous volatility as an explicitly illustrated example of the main result.

Keywords: G-expectation; G-Brownian motion; stochastic optimal control; stochastic maximum principle; model uncertainty; ambiguous volatility

1 Introduction

Traditionally, we describe the risk with a unique probability measure. However, because of a variety of uncertainties in the financial markets, we are often faced with Knightian uncertainty(model uncertainty or ambiguity)(see Knight Frank [19]). Knightian uncertainty indicates that the decision makers have a skeptical attitude on the model he used and unable to obtain an accurate form of the model objectively, which is due to incomplete information, vague concept etc. In early 1961, Ellsberg [8] put forward the famous Ellsberg paradox based on experiments, he pointed out the existing of Knightian uncertainty would have an effect on decision makers' behavior and this behavior could not be described by a unique prior. So after the Ellsberg paradox the occurrence of

[*]School of Mathematical Sciences, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China; E-mail: zysun_nk@126.com

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China; E-mail: nku.x.zhang@gmail.com

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China; E-mail: jyguo@nankai.edu.cn

ambiguity aversion and its effect on making economic decisions are well established. One possible way to model decisions under Knightian uncertainty is to use multiple priors instead of analyzing a problem in a single prior model as in the classical situation.

These models have gained much attentions in recent years. The decisions theoretical setting of multiple priors was first put forth by Gilboa and Schmeidler [14] for a static setting and extended to a dynamic model by Epstein and Schneider [11]. So a natural question is how to construct these priors? Most literatures essentially focus on the modeling of multiple priors with respect to some reference measures. The standing assumption is that all priors entertained by decision makers are equivalent to a given reference probability measure, that is, they agree which events are null. This is often a technical assumption in order to simplify mathematics. In diffusion models, by Girsanov's theorem this assumption only lead to uncertainty in the mean of the considered stochastic processes. Under the model uncertainty, by using the method of robust control, Hansen et al. [15] discussed min-max expected utility where an ambiguity about volatility was not considered. Also in Chen and Epstein [4], Cheng and Riedel [5], Zhang and Siu [30] and Fei [12], all these papers have the same assumption. So there is no ambiguity about volatility. Thus in finance, these multiple priors just lead to drift uncertainty for the stock price.

We know that from economic perspective, the above equivalent assumption seems far from innocuous. Obviously, one may imagine another source of uncertainty which involves the risk described by the standard deviation of a random variable. Take the financial markets as an example, we know that the price of an option written on a risky stock heavily rely on the underlying volatility. Also, the value of a portfolio consisting of risky positions is strongly connected with the volatility levels of the corresponding assets. In this sense it appears quite natural to permit volatility uncertainty. So the ambiguity about volatility comes to people's consideration. A large literatures have argued that stochastic time varying volatility is important for understanding empirical features of asset markets. For recent examples, see Drechsler [7], Bollerslev et al. [2], Campbell et al. [3] and Bansal et al. [1] etc.

Thus we are led to develop a model of preference that accommodates ambiguity about volatility. In the model the individuals take a stand only on bounds rather than on any particular parametric model of volatility dynamics. So maximization of preference leads to decisions that are robust to misspecifications of the dynamics of volatility (as well as drift). Epstein and Ji [9, 10] generalized the Chen and Epstein [4] model and formulated a model of utility for a continuous time framework that captures the decision makers' concern with ambiguity about both volatility and drift. To illustrate the latter perspective explicitly, consider a portfolio optimization problem in finance.

Roughly, a risky stock's price S is modeled by the family of processes

$$dS_t^\sigma = rS_t^\sigma dt + \sigma_t S_t^\sigma dB_t$$

where $B = (B_t)$ is a classical Brownian motion on a given probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and σ_t attains various values in $[\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ for all t. In this setting, we aim to solve

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E^P(U(X_T)) \quad and \quad \inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E^P(U(X_T))$$

where X_T denotes the terminal wealth of an investor, U is the utility function, and $\mathcal{P}$ presents a set of various probability measures describing the model uncertainty. It is by no means clear whether the expressions above are well-posed and how to choose $\mathcal{P}$ in this case. If $\underline{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}$, this special case of a single process for volatility indicates the investor's complete confidence in the implied dynamics. Otherwise, if $\hat{\sigma} \neq \tilde{\sigma}$ we have $\langle S^{\hat{\sigma}} \rangle_t \neq \langle S^{\tilde{\sigma}} \rangle_t$. P-almost surely which implies that the distributions $P \circ (S^{\hat{\sigma}})^{-1}$ and $P \circ (S^{\tilde{\sigma}})^{-1}$ are mutually singular, and hence not equivalent[1]. Thus this leads to a set of nonequivalent priors $\mathcal{P}$.

So when dealing with model uncertainty we need a consistent mathematical framework enable us to work with processes under various probability measures at the same time. To this end, many researchers investigate the characteristics of model uncertainty in order to provide a framework for theory and applications. Motivated by measuring risk and other financial problems with uncertainty, Peng [23] think that a classical Brownian motion can not characterize ambiguous volatility, then he put forth G-Brownian motion and the related *Itô* calculus which started a new area of research. Recently, the theory of sublinear expectation space, which is a generalization of probability space, provides a new perspective for the stochastic calculus under Knightian uncertainty. The G-expectation, a special type of sublinear expectation, has played an important role in the researches of sublinear expectation space. More importantly it can be represented as an upper expectation of a subset of linear expectations. In most cases, this subset reflects the uncertainty degree of the decision maker. Within this G-expectation framework, the G-Brownian motion is the canonical process. Besides, the notions of the G-martingale and the martingale representation theorem under G-expectation is proven. Also, the existence and uniqueness of solution of a SDE driven by G-Brownian motion can be proved in a way parallel to that in the classical SDE theory. see Hu and Peng [16], Peng [22, 23, 24, 25]. Thus we utilize the framework of sublinear expectation and G-Brownian motion in order to model and control model risk.

[1]Two measures P and P' on Ω are singular if there exists $A \subset \Omega$ such that $P(A) = 1$ and $P'(A) = 0$. They are equivalent, if for every A, $P(A) = 0$ if and only if $P'(A) = 0$. Thus P and P' singular implies that they are not equivalent, but the converse is false.

Since it is important to study optimal stochastic controls from the perspective of economics, and the classical stochastic control can not consider a model uncertainty(especially, ambiguity about volatility). It is necessary to investigate a system with ambiguity by a calculus of sublinear expectation. Our purpose is how we provide a framework of stochastic control system under Knightian uncertainty. Recently, the study of optimal stochastic control including dynamic programming principle and the corresponding HJB equations based on Peng's sublinear expectation is studied by Zhang [29], Fei and Fei [13] and Hu et al. [18]. To our best knowledge, the study of stochastic maximum principle under G-expectation framework is still not found. The maximum principle, formulated and derived by Pontryagin and his group in the 1950s, is truly a milestone of optimal control theory. It states that any optimal control along with the optimal state trajectory must solve the so-called Hamiltonian system, which consists of two backward stochastic differential equations called adjoint processes, plus a maximum condition of a function called Hamiltonian. The mathematical significance of the maximum principle lies in that maximizing the Hamiltonian is much easier than the original control problem. Elegant investigation of the classical case is provided by Peng [21] and Young and Zhou [28].

In this paper, we will investigate a set of necessary conditions that must be satisfied by any optimal solution under the G-expectation framework. These necessary conditions become sufficient under certain convexity conditions on the objective or constraint functions. Since the $It\hat{o}$ integral $\int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \sigma dB(t)$ is only of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ under each prior $P \in \mathcal{P}$. So, in deriving the maximum principle, one first slightly perturbs an optimal control by means of the so-called *spike variation*, then considers both the first-order and second-order terms in the Taylor expansion with respect to this perturbation. By sending the perturbation to zero, one obtains a stochastic maximum principle involving a stochastic Hamiltonian system that consists of two BSDE driven by G-Brownian motion and a maximum condition. we refer the reader to Hu et al. [17] for more details of the G-BSDE.

In a word, when we are faced with Knightian uncertainty, the stochastic control system perturbed by G-Brownian motion will be important for characterizing the real world with both randomness and ambiguity. Specially, it is necessary to study the problem of optimal stochastic controls with ambiguity in a similar manner as in classical ones. To this end, we organize the paper as follows: In section 2, we present some fundamental results on G-expectation theory and adapt it according to our objective. In section 3, we give the statement of the problem and our main assumptions. Section 4 gives our variational equations $y^{\varepsilon}(\cdot)$ and $z^{\varepsilon}(\cdot)$, we also treat the estimations of these terms. Then we obtain the first- and second-order adjoint processes. Consequently, the second-order variational inequality and our main result, the maximum principle is

given in section 5. In section 6, we will show the maximum condition in terms of the $\mathcal{H}$-function plus some convexity conditions constitute sufficient conditions for optimality. As an application, section 7 studies a portfolio optimization problem with ambiguous volatility from the deriving results. Finally Section 8 concludes.

2 Preliminaries

For the convenience of the reader we review some basic notions and results of G-expectation, the related spaces of random variables and the stochastic differential equations driven by G-Brownian motion. The readers may refer to Peng [22, 23, 24, 25] for more details.

Let Ω be a given set and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear space of real valued functions defined on Ω, such that $c \in \mathcal{H}$ for each constant c and $|X| \in \mathcal{H}$ if $X \in \mathcal{H}$. $\mathcal{H}$ is considered as the space of random variables.

Definition 2.1. *A sublinear expectation $\mathbb{E}$ is a functional $\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following properties: for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$,*

(i) Monotonicity: If $X \geq Y$ then $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y]$;

(ii) Constant preservation: $\mathbb{E}[c] = c$;

(iii) Sub-additivity: $\mathbb{E}[X + Y] \leq \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]$;

(iv) Positive homogeneity: $\mathbb{E}[\lambda X] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[X]$ for each $\lambda \geq 0$.

The triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E})$ is called a sublinear expectation space.

Let X_1 and X_2 be two n-dimensional random vectors in sublinear expectation space $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \mathbb{E}_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathbb{E}_2)$ respectively. We denote by $C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of real continuous functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq C(1 + |x|^k + |y|^k)|x - y| \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where k and C depend only on φ.

Definition 2.2. *We call X_1 and X_2 identically distributed, denoted by $X_1 \overset{d}{=} X_2$, if for all $\varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_1[\varphi(X_1)] = \mathbb{E}_2[\varphi(X_2)].$$

Definition 2.3. *In a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E})$, a random vector $Y \in \mathcal{H}^n$ is said to be independent from another random vector $X \in \mathcal{H}^m$ under $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$, denoted by $Y \perp X$, if for each test function $\varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}].$$

Let $\langle p, q\rangle$ denote the inner product of vectors $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We define

$$\langle A, B\rangle := tr(AB^\top) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{ij}b_{ij}, \text{ for } A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d} \tag{2.1}$$

Definition 2.4. *(G-normal distribution) A d-dimensional random vector $X = (X_1, \cdots, X_d)$ on a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{E})$ is called G-normal distributed if for each $a, b \geq 0$, we have*

$$aX + b\bar{X} \overset{d}{=} \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}X$$

,where $\bar{X}$ is an independent copy of X, i.e. $\bar{X} \overset{d}{=} X$ and $\bar{X} \perp X$. Here the letter G denotes the function

$$G(A) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\langle AX, X\rangle] : S(d) \to \mathbb{R} \tag{2.2}$$

where $S(d)$ denotes the collection of all $d \times d$ symmetric matrices.

Remark 2.5. It is easy to check that G is a monotonic sublinear function defined on $S(d)$ and $G(A) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\langle AX, X\rangle] \leq \frac{1}{2}|A|\mathbb{E}[|X|^2] \leq \frac{1}{2}|A|\bar{\sigma}^2$ implies that there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset $\Gamma \subset S^{>0}(d)$ such that

$$G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma} tr(\gamma A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\langle\gamma, A\rangle, \tag{2.3}$$

where $S^{>0}(d)$ denotes the collection of nonnegative elements in $S(d)$.

Let $\Omega = C_0([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the space of real valued continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ with $\omega_0 = 0$ and let $B_t(\omega) = \omega_t$ be the canonical process. Set

$$L_{ip}(\Omega) := \{\varphi(B_{t_1}, \cdots, B_{t_n}) : n \geq 1, t_1, \cdots, t_n \in [0, \infty), \varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{d\times n})\}.$$

Let $\{\xi_n : n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of identically distributed d-dimensional G-normal distributed random vectors in a sunlinear expectation space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathbb{E}})$ such that ξ_{i+1} is independent from $(\xi_1, \cdots \xi_i)$ for all $i \geq 1$.

Definition 2.6. *For each $X = \varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdots, B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}}) \in L_{ip}(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq t_0 \leq \cdots \leq t_n$, the G-expectation of X is defined by*

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[X] = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(\sqrt{t_1 - t_0}\xi_1, \cdots \sqrt{t_n - t_{n-1}}\xi_n)].$$

The conditional G-expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_t$ *of* X *with* $t = t_i$ *is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{t_i}[\varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdots, B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})]\\ &= \psi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdots, B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\psi(x_1, \cdots, x_i) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\varphi(x_1, \cdots, x_i, B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}, \cdots, B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})].$$

$(\Omega, L_{ip}(\Omega), \hat{\mathbb{E}})$ *is called a G-expectation space. The corresponding canonical process* $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *is called a G-Brownian motion.*

We denote by $L_G^p(\Omega)$ the completion of $L_{ip}(\Omega)$ under the norm $\|X\|_{p,G} = (\hat{\mathbb{E}}[|X|^p])^{1/p}$ for $p \geq 1$. For each fixed $T > 0$, set

$$L_{ip}(\Omega_T) := \{\varphi(B_{t_1}, \cdots, B_{t_n}) : n \geq 1, t_1, \cdots, t_n \in [0, T], \varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{d\times n})\}.$$

Obviously, $L_{ip}(\Omega_T) \subset L_{ip}(\Omega)$, then we can similarly define $L_G^p(\Omega_T)$ for all $p \geq 1$.

Definition 2.7. *Let* $M_G^{p,0}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ *be the collection of processes in the following form: for a given partition* $\{t_0, \cdots, t_N\} = \pi_T$ *of* $[0, T]$,

$$\eta_t(\omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j(\omega) I_{[t_j, t_{j+1})}(t),$$

where $\xi_i \in L_{ip}(\Omega_{t_i}), i = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$.

We denote by $M_G^p(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the completion of $M_G^{p,0}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ under the norm $\|\eta\|_{M_G^p} = \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\int_0^T |\eta_s|^p ds]\}^{1/p}$ for $p \geq 1$.

Definition 2.8. *For each* $\eta \in M_G^{2,0}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$, *we define*

$$I(\eta) = \int_0^T \eta_t dB_t := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j (B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}). \tag{2.4}$$

The mapping $I : M_G^{2,0}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) \to L_G^2(\Omega_T)$ *is continuous and thus can be continuously extended to* $M_G^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Definition 2.9. *The quadratic variation process of G-Brownian motion is defined by*

$$\langle B\rangle_t := B_t^2 - 2\int_0^t B_s dB_s, \tag{2.5}$$

which is a continuous, nondecreasing process.

Definition 2.10. *We now define the integral of a process $\eta \in M_G^{1,0}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$ with respect to $\langle B\rangle_t$ as follows:*

$$Q_{0,T}(\eta) = \int_0^T \eta_t d\langle B\rangle_t := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j(\langle B\rangle_{t_{j+1}} - \langle B\rangle_{t_j}), \tag{2.6}$$

The mapping $Q_{0,T} : M_G^{1,0}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n) \to L_G^1(\Omega_T)$ is continuous and thus can be continuously extended to $M_G^1(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 2.11. *For the above $\eta \in M_G^{2,0}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have*

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\int_0^T \eta_t dB_t\Big] = 0 \text{ and } \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[(\int_0^T \eta_t dB_t)^2\Big] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\int_0^t \eta_t^2 d\langle B\rangle_t\Big]. \tag{2.7}$$

From Soner et al. [26], or Epstein and Ji [10] we can define

$$v_t = \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\langle B\rangle_t - \langle B\rangle_{t-\varepsilon}) \tag{2.8}$$

where $\overline{\lim}$ is taken componentwise. If $P = P^{(\sigma_t)}$ is a prior in $\mathcal{P}$, then $v_t = \sigma_t\sigma_t^\top \in \Gamma$ such that

$$d\langle B\rangle_t = v_t dt = \sigma_t\sigma_t^\top dt \qquad dt \times P^{(\sigma_t)} - a.e.$$

which shows that

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\langle A, v_t\rangle] = 2G(A), \quad \forall A \in S(d). \tag{2.9}$$

Theorem 2.12. *(G-Itô Formula, Epstein and Ji [10]) Consider*

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \alpha_s ds + \int_0^t \gamma_s dB_s$$

where $\alpha \in M_G^{2,0}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\gamma \in M_G^{2,0}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^{n\times d})$ are bounded. We adapt the Itô formula from (Li and Peng [20] Theorem 5.4) and rewrite it in our context. Let $0 \le s \le t \le T$; define $v = (v^{ij})$ by (2.8). Then, for any function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with continuous second order derivatives, we have

$$f(X_t) - f(X_s) = \int_s^t (f_x(X_s))^\top \gamma_s dB_s + \int_s^t (f_x(X_s))^\top \alpha_s ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_s^t tr[\gamma_s^\top f_{xx}(X_s) v_s \gamma_s] ds. \tag{2.10}$$

Theorem 2.13. *(Denis et al. [6], Hu and Peng [16]) There exists a family of weakly compact probability measure $\mathcal{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ such that*

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\xi] = \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E_P[\xi] \quad \text{for all } \xi \in L_G^1(\Omega).$$

$\mathcal{P}$ is called a set that represents $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$.

Let $\{W_t\}$ be a classical d-dimensional Brownian motion on a probability space $(\Omega^0, \mathcal{F}^0, P^0)$ and let $F^0 = \{\mathcal{F}_t^0\}$ be the augmented filtration generated by W. Set

$$\mathcal{P}_M := \Big\{P_\theta : P_\theta = P^0 \circ (B_t^{\theta,0})^{-1}, B_t^{\theta,0} = \int_0^t \theta_s dW_s, \theta \in L^2_{F^0}([0,T];\Gamma)\Big\},$$

where $L^2_{F^0}([0,T];\Gamma)$ is the collection of F^0-adapted square integrable measure processes with values in Γ. Set $\mathcal{P} = \overline{\mathcal{P}_M}$ the closure of $\mathcal{P}_M$ under the topology of weak convergence, then $\mathcal{P}$ is weakly compact. Denis et al. [6] proved that $\mathcal{P}$ represents $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ on $L^1_G(\Omega_T)$.

For this $\mathcal{P}$, we define capacity

$$c(A) := \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} P(A), A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega).$$

a set $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ is polar if $c(A) = 0$. A property holds "quasi-surly" ($q.s.$ for short) if it holds outside a polar set. In the following, we do not distinguish two random variables X and Y if $X = Y$ $q.s.$.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $\{P_n : n \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{P}$ converge weakly to P. Then for each $\xi \in L^1_G(\Omega)$, we have $E_{P_n}[\xi] \to E_P[\xi]$.*

Theorem 2.15. *(Peng [25], Theorem VI-1.31) Let $\mathcal{P}$ be weakly compact and let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{L}^1_c$ be such that $X_n \downarrow X$, $q.s.$. Then $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[X_n] \downarrow \hat{\mathbb{E}}[X]$.*

3 Statement of the problem

We first give the definition of admissible controls.

Definition 3.1. *For each $t \in [0,T]$, u is said to be an admissible control, if it satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) $u : [0,T] \times \Omega \to U$ *where U is a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$;*

(ii) $u \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The set of admissible controls on $[0,T]$ is denoted by $\mathcal{U}[0,T]$.

We consider the following stochastic controlled system:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = b(t,X_t,u_t)ds + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^d h^{ij}(t,X_t,u_t)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t + \sum\limits_{j=1}^d \sigma^j(t,X_t,u_t)dB_t^j, \quad t\in[0,T], \\ X_0 = x, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Where $B = (B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a d-dimensional G-Brownian motion.

First of all, we consider a controller makes a decision with pessimistic or negative attitude on Knightian uncertainty. Thus, we may suppose that the cost functional of our control problem with multiple priors $\mathcal{P}$ as follows:

$$J(u(\cdot)) := \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E_P\Big[\int_0^T f(t,X_t,u_t)dt + g(X_T)\Big] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\int_0^T f(t,X_t,u_t)dt + g(X_T)\Big]. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $-\hat{\mathbb{E}}[-\xi] = \inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E_p[\xi]$, we may also suppose that the cost functional is as follows:

$$\widetilde{J}(u(\cdot)) := \inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E_P\Big[\int_0^T f(t,X_t,u_t)dt + g(X_T)\Big] = -\hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[-\int_0^T f(t,X_t,u_t)dt - g(X_T)\Big]. \tag{3.3}$$

Here we notice that a controller's decision is based on a optimistic or positive attitude on Knightian uncertainty. Since the derivation of the above two cases are similar, we only consider the first case.

In the above, $b, h^{ij} : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times U\to\mathbb{R}^n, \sigma : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times U\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times d}, f : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times U\to\mathbb{R}$, and $h : \mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ for all $1\le i,j\le d$. We define:

$$\begin{cases} b(t,x,u) = \begin{pmatrix} b^1(t,x,u) \\ \vdots \\ b^n(t,x,u), \end{pmatrix}, \\ \sigma(t,x,u) = (\sigma^1(t,x,u),\cdots,\sigma^n(t,x,u)), \\ \sigma^j(t,x,u) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^{1j}(t,x,u) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^{nj}(t,x,u) \end{pmatrix}, 1\le j\le d. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

We now introduce our assumptions:

(1) b, h^{ij}, σ, f, g are twice continuously differentiable with respect to x. They and all their derivatives $b_x, b_{xx}, h^{ij}_x, h^{ij}_{xx}, \sigma_x, \sigma_{xx}, f_x, f_{xx}, g_x, g_{xx}$ are continuous in (x,u);

(2) There exists a constant $L>0$, for any $t\in[0,T], x,x'\in\mathbb{R}^n, u,u'\in\mathcal{U}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} |b(t,x,u)-b(t,x',u')| + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^d |h^{ij}(t,x,u)-h^{ij}(t,x',u')| + \sum\limits_{j=1}^d |\sigma^j(t,x,u)-\sigma^j(t,x',u')| \\ \le L(|x-x'|+|u-u'|), \\ |f(t,x,u)-f(t,x',u')| + |g(x)-g(x')| \le L(|x-x'|+|u-u'|); \end{cases}$$

(3) $b_x, b_{xx}, h^{ij}_x, h^{ij}_{xx}, \sigma_x, \sigma_{xx}, f_x, f_{xx}, g_x, g_{xx}$ are bounded and

$$\begin{cases} |b_x(t,x,u)-b_x(t,x',u)| + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^d |h^{ij}_x(t,x,u)-h^{ij}_x(t,x',u)| + \sum\limits_{j=1}^d |\sigma^j_x(t,x,u)-\sigma^j_x(t,x',u)| \\ \le L(|x-x'|), \\ |f_x(t,x,u)-f_x(t,x',u)| + |g_x(x)-g_x(x')| \le L(|x-x'|). \end{cases}$$

From Peng [25], we see that under assumption (2), for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0,T]$, the state equation (3.1) admits a unique solution and the cost functional (3.2) or (3.3) are well-defined. In the case that $X(\cdot)$ is the solution of (3.1) corresponding to $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0,T]$, we call $(X(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ an admissible pair, and $X(\cdot)$ an admissible state trajectory. Our optimal control problem can be stated as follows.

Problem 3.1. Minimize (3.2) over $\mathcal{U}[0,T]$.

Any $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0,T]$ satisfying

$$J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]} J(u(\cdot)) \tag{3.5}$$

is called an optimal control. The corresponding $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ is called an optimal pair.

4 Variational equations and their moment estimation under G-expectation

The purpose of this section is to derive a kind of variational equations. Due to the appearance of the control variable in $\sigma(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ and the control domain U not necessarily convex, the usual first-order expansion approach does not work. Hence, we introduce a second-order expansion method. Let $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ be an optimal pair. Then the following is satisfied:

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}_t = b(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t)ds + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{d} h^{ij}(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t)d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{d} \sigma^j(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t)dB_t^j, \quad t\in[0,T], \\ \bar{X}_0 = x. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

It is classical to construct a perturbed admissible control in the following way (spike variation): For any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0,T]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Define

$$u_t^\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_t, & t \in [0,T]\backslash E_\varepsilon, \\ u_t, & t \in E_\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where $E_\varepsilon \subset [0,T]$ is a measurable set with $|E_\varepsilon| = \varepsilon$. Let $(X^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ satisfy the following:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^\varepsilon = b(t,X_t^\varepsilon,u_t^\varepsilon)ds + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{d} h^{ij}(t,X_t^\varepsilon,u_t^\varepsilon)d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{d} \sigma^j(t,X_t^\varepsilon,u_t^\varepsilon)dB_t^j, \quad t\in[0,T], \\ X_0^\varepsilon = x. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

In order to estimate the moment of $X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t$ under $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$, we prove an elementary lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $Y_t \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the solution of the following:*

$$\begin{cases} dY_t = \{A_tY_t + \alpha_t\}dt + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{d}\{B_t^jY_t + \beta_t^j\}dB_t^j + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{d}\{C_t^{ij}Y_t + \gamma^{ij}\}d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t, \\ Y_0 = y, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

where $A, B^j, C^{ij} \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ *are bounded, and* $\alpha, \beta^j, \gamma^{ij} \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that*

$$\int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\alpha_s|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{2k}} ds + \int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\beta_s^j|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{k}} ds + \int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\gamma_s^{ij}|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{2k}} < \infty,$$

for some $k \geq 1$ *and all* $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|Y_t|^{2k} \quad \leq \quad & K\Big\{|y|^{2k} + \Big(\int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\alpha_s|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{2k}} ds\Big)^{2k} + \sum_{j=1}^d \Big(\int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\beta_s^j|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{k}} ds\Big)^k \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \Big(\int_0^T \{\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\gamma_s^{ij}|^{2k}\}^{\frac{1}{2k}} ds\Big)^{2k}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Since a controller has a multiple priors set $\mathcal{P}$ which is weakly compact, for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists a $0 < K(P) < \infty$ depending on P such that (4.4) holds in a way similar to the proof of Lemma III-4.2 in Young and Zhou [28]. Set $K = \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} K(P)$. Thanks to $\mathcal{P}$ being weakly compact, we have that $K < \infty$. In fact, if the above claim is not true, then for each positive integer $N > 0$ there exists a $P_N \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $K(P_N) > N$ which shows that $K(P_N) \uparrow \infty$. On the other hand, by the weak compactness of $\mathcal{P}$ there exists a subsequence $\{P_{N_k}\}$ of $\{P_N\}$ with $K(P_{N_k}) \uparrow \infty$ such that $P_{N_k} \xrightarrow{w} P \in \mathcal{P}$ with $K(P) < \infty$. Due to the weak convergence we have $K(P_{N_k}) \to K(P)$. This is a contradiction. Thus the proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.2. *Under our assumption* (1)-(3). *Then for any* $k \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t|^{2k} = O(\varepsilon^k). \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The proof is just similar to Theorem III-4.4 in Young and Zhou [28] for a direct calculation by using lemma 4.1 and we omit it. □

Next, we will use Theorem 4.2 to divide $X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t$ into two parts which is of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and order ε, respectively. Then, $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ denotes the part with order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ denotes the other part. For simplicity of presentation, we define:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_x(t) \triangleq \varphi_x(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \quad \varphi_{xx}(t) \triangleq \varphi_{xx}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \\ \delta\varphi(t) \triangleq \varphi(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t) - \varphi(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \\ \delta\varphi_x(t) \triangleq \varphi_x(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t) - \varphi_x(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \\ \delta\varphi_{xx}(t) \triangleq \varphi_{xx}(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t) - \varphi_{xx}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t). \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

for $\varphi = b, h^{ij}, \sigma^j, f$ and $g \quad (1 \leq i, j \leq d)$.

A direct calculation, Taylor expansion and Theorem 4.2 show that

$$X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^t \Big(b(s,X_s^\varepsilon,u_s^\varepsilon)-b(s,\bar X_s,\bar u_s)\Big)ds+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(h^{ij}(s,X_s^\varepsilon,u_s^\varepsilon)-h^{ij}(s,\bar X_s,\bar u_s)\Big)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_s\\
&\quad+\sum_{j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(\sigma^j(s,X_s^\varepsilon,u_s^\varepsilon)-\sigma^j(s,\bar X_s,\bar u_s)\Big)dB_s^j\\
&= \int_0^t\Big(b_x(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)+\delta b(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\frac{1}{2}b_{xx}(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)ds\\
&\quad+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(h_x^{ij}(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)+\delta h^{ij}(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_s\\
&\quad+\sum_{j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(\sigma_x^j(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)+\delta\sigma^j(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(s,\bar X_s,u_s^\varepsilon)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)dB_s^j+o(\varepsilon)\\
&= \int_0^t\Big(\underline{b_x(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)}+\delta b(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\frac{1}{2}b_{xx}(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)ds\\
&\quad+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(\underline{h_x^{ij}(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)}+\delta h^{ij}(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_s\\
&\quad+\sum_{j=1}^d\int_0^t\Big(\underline{\sigma_x^j(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)}+\delta\sigma_x^j(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)+\underline{\delta\sigma^j(s)I_{E_\varepsilon}(s)}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(s)(X_s^\varepsilon-\bar X_s)^2\Big)dB_s^j+o(\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to check the underline parts are of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and others are of order ε under $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$. So we can define $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ be respectively the solution of the following G-SDE:

$$
\begin{cases}
dy_t^\varepsilon=b_x(t)y_t^\varepsilon dt+\sum\limits_{i,j=1}^d h_x^{ij}(t)y_t^\varepsilon d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t+\sum\limits_{j=1}^d\Big\{\sigma_x^j(t)y_t^\varepsilon+\delta\sigma^j(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big\}dB_t^j,\quad t\in[0,T]\\
y_0^\varepsilon=0.
\end{cases}
\tag{4.7}
$$

and

$$
\begin{cases}
dz_t^\varepsilon=\Big\{b_x(t)z_t^\varepsilon+\delta b(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)+\frac{1}{2}b_{xx}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\Big\}dt+\sum\limits_{i,j=1}^d\Big\{h_x^{ij}(t)z_t^\varepsilon+\delta h^{ij}(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\\
\qquad\qquad+\frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(s)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\Big\}d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t+\sum\limits_{j=1}^d\Big\{\sigma_x^j(t)z_t^\varepsilon+\delta\sigma_x^j(t)y_t^\varepsilon I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\\
\qquad\qquad+\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\Big\}dB_t^j,\quad t\in[0,T]\\
z_0^\varepsilon=0.
\end{cases}
\tag{4.8}
$$

where for $\varphi=b,h^{ij},\sigma^j$ and φ^k denotes the k-th component.

$$
\varphi_{xx}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2=\begin{pmatrix} tr(\varphi_{xx}^1(t)y_t^\varepsilon(y_t^\varepsilon)^\top)\\ \vdots\\ tr(\varphi_{xx}^n(t)y_t^\varepsilon(y_t^\varepsilon)^\top)\end{pmatrix}
$$

Equation (4.7) is called the first-order variational equation, and we call (4.8) the second-order variational equation. Then we have the following estimation:

Theorem 4.3. *Let assumption (1)-(3) hold. Then for any $k \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|y_t^\varepsilon|^{2k} = O(\varepsilon^k), \tag{4.9}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|z_t^\varepsilon|^{2k} = O(\varepsilon^{2k}), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t - y_t^\varepsilon|^{2k} = O(\varepsilon^{2k}), \tag{4.11}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \hat{\mathbb{E}}|X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t - y_t^\varepsilon - z_t^\varepsilon|^{2k} = o(\varepsilon^{2k}). \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. The proof of the above theorem is in a way rather similar to Theorem III-4.4 in Young and Zhou [28] by using lemma 4.1 and we omit the details. □

Since $\bar{u}_t$ is an optimal control, from Theorem 4.2 and 4.3 we can easily derive the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Under Theorem 4.2 and 4.3, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \quad \leq \quad & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), y_T^\varepsilon + z_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)y_T^\varepsilon, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^T \Big[\langle f_x(t), y_t^\varepsilon + z_t^\varepsilon\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\langle f_{xx}(t)y_t^\varepsilon, y_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \delta f(t) I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big]dt\Big\} + o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. It is obvious $J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \geq 0$ by using $\bar{u}_t$ is an optimal control.

Then, for notational simplicity, we define $\xi_t^\varepsilon \triangleq X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t$, $\eta_t^\varepsilon \triangleq X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t - y_t^\varepsilon$, and $\zeta_t^\varepsilon \triangleq X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t - y_t^\varepsilon - z_t^\varepsilon$. By Sub-additivity of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ and Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \\ = \quad & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T f(t, X_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon)dt + g(X_T^\varepsilon)\Big\} - \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)dt + g(\bar{X}_T)\Big\} \\ \leq \quad & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, X_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon) - f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)]dt + g(X_T^\varepsilon) - g(\bar{X}_T)\Big\} \\ = \quad & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), \xi_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \theta g_{xx}(\theta\bar{X}_T + (1-\theta)X_T^\varepsilon)\xi_T^\varepsilon, \xi_T^\varepsilon\rangle d\theta + \int_0^T \Big[\delta f(t) I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \\ & + \langle f_x(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t^\varepsilon), \xi_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \theta f_{xx}(t, \theta\bar{X}_t + (1-\theta)X_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon)\xi_t^\varepsilon, \xi_t^\varepsilon\rangle d\theta\Big]dt\Big\} \\ = \quad & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), y_T^\varepsilon + Z_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), \zeta_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)y_T^\varepsilon, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{2}\langle g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)\eta_T^\varepsilon, \xi_T^\varepsilon + y_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \theta[g_{xx}(\theta\bar{X}_T + (1-\theta)X_T^\varepsilon) - g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)]\xi_T^\varepsilon, \xi_T^\varepsilon\rangle d\theta \\
&+\int_0^T \Big(\delta f(t) I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \langle f_x(t), y_t^\varepsilon + z_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \langle f_x(t), \zeta_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \langle \delta f_x(t), \xi_t^\varepsilon\rangle I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \\
&+\frac{1}{2}\langle f_{xx}(t) y_t^\varepsilon, y_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle f_{xx}(t)\eta_t^\varepsilon, \xi_t^\varepsilon + y_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle \delta f_{xx}(t)\xi_t^\varepsilon, \xi_t^\varepsilon\rangle I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \\
&+\int_0^1 \langle \theta[f_{xx}(t, \theta\bar{X}_t + (1-\theta)X_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon) - f_{xx}(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t^\varepsilon)]\xi_t^\varepsilon, \xi_t^\varepsilon\rangle d\theta\Big) dt\Big\} \\
\leq\ & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), y_T^\varepsilon + Z_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T) y_T^\varepsilon, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^T \Big[\delta f(t) I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \\
&+\langle f_x(t), y_t^\varepsilon + z_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle f_{xx}(t) y_t^\varepsilon, y_t^\varepsilon\rangle\Big] dt\Big\} + o(\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}
$$

Where the last inequality is due to Sub-additivity; assumption (1)-(3); (4.5); and (4.9)-(4.12). Hence, our conclusions follows. □

So far, we have a necessary condition of the optimal pair $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ in terms of $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ that depends on the choice of $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0,T]$. However, (4.13) is only a sort of implicit necessary condition that is not easily applicable, as it involves $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. So in order to get rid of them, we have to introduce the adjoint processes.

5 Adjoint processes and the maximum principle

In this section, we introduce the first- and second-order adjoint processes for (4.7) and (4.8). With these processes we are able to get rid of $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. Then our main results can be easily derived by (4.13).

We are now in a position to to get rid of $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. To this end, we set $p_T = g_x(\bar{X}_T)$, by G-*Itô* formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle p_T, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle &= \langle p_0, y_0^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^T \langle p_t, dy_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \int_0^T \langle y_t^\varepsilon, dp_t\rangle + \langle p, y^\varepsilon\rangle_T \\
&= \int_0^T \langle p_t, b_x(t) y_t^\varepsilon\rangle dt + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^T \langle p_t, h_x^{ij}(t) y_t^\varepsilon\rangle d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^T \langle p_t, \sigma_x^j(t) y_t^\varepsilon \\
&\quad +\delta\sigma^j(t) I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\rangle dB_t^j + \int_0^T \langle y_t^\varepsilon, dp_t\rangle + \langle p, y^\varepsilon\rangle_T
\end{aligned}
$$

Also, we can calculate $\langle p_T, z_T^\varepsilon\rangle$ in the same manner. As we can see in the above equality and (4.13). In order to get rid of the first-order terms in $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, we introduce the first-order

adjoint equation as follows:

$$\begin{cases} dp_t = -\Big\{[b_x(t)^\top p_t + f_x(t)]dt + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{d}[h_x^{ij}(t)^\top p_t + \sigma_x^j(t)^\top q_t^i]d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t\Big\} \\ \qquad\quad +q_t dB_t, \qquad t\in[0,T], \\ p_T = g_x(\bar{X}_T). \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

Obviously, the above is a G-BSDE and the unknown is a pair of processes $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot))$ with $q(\cdot) = (q^1(\cdot), \cdots, q^d(\cdot))$. Any pair of processes $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot)) \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n) \times (M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n))^d$ satisfying (5.1) is called an solution of (5.1). From Hu et al. [17], we will have the following: Under assumptions (1)-(3), for any $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot)) \in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U}[0,T]$, (5.1) admits a unique solution $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot))$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p_T, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle &= -\int_0^T \langle f_x(t), y_t^\varepsilon\rangle dt + \sum_{j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \sigma_x^j(t)y_t^\varepsilon + \delta\sigma^j(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\rangle + \langle y_t^\varepsilon, q_t^j\rangle\Big]dB_t^j \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \langle q_t^i, \delta\sigma^j(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\rangle d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p_T, z_T^\varepsilon\rangle &= \int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta b(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}b_{xx}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle - \langle f_x(t), z_t^\varepsilon\rangle\Big]dt + \sum_{j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \sigma_x^j(t)z_t^\varepsilon \\ &\quad +\delta\sigma_x^j(t)y_t^\varepsilon I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle + \langle z_t^\varepsilon, q_t^j\rangle\Big]dB_t^j \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta h^{ij}(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle \\ &\quad +\langle q_t^i, \delta\sigma_x^j(t)y_t^\varepsilon I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle\Big]d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Adding (5.2) and (5.3), appealing to (4.13), and using (2.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \\ \le\ & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta b(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}b_{xx}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle f_{xx}(t)y_t^\varepsilon, y_t^\varepsilon\rangle + \delta f(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big]dt \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta h^{ij}(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle + \langle q_t^i, \delta\sigma^j(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{xx}^j(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle\Big]d\langle B^i, B^j\rangle_t + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)y_T^\varepsilon, y_T^\varepsilon\rangle\Big\} + o(\varepsilon) \\ =\ & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T \Big[(H(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t,p_t) - H(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,p_t))I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}tr(H_{xx}(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,p_t)Y_t^\varepsilon)\Big]dt \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d}\int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta h^{ij}(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) + \frac{1}{2}h_{xx}^{ij}(t)(y_t^\varepsilon)^2\rangle + \langle q_t^i, \delta\sigma^j(t)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

$$\tag{5.5}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^j_{xx}(t)(y^\varepsilon_t)^2\rangle\Big]d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t+\frac{1}{2}tr(g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)Y^\varepsilon_T)\Big\}+o(\varepsilon).$$

Where

$$\begin{cases} H(t,x,u,p)=\langle p_t,b(t,x,u)\rangle+f(t,x,u),\\ Y^\varepsilon_t=y^\varepsilon_t(y^\varepsilon_t)^\top. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

We see that (5.5) no longer contains the first-order terms in $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. But, there are left some second-order terms in $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, which are written in terms of the first-order in $Y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. Hence, we want further to get rid of $Y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. To this end, we will introduce the second-order adjoint equation. Let us first derive the G-SDE satisfied by $Y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$. Applying G-*Itô* formula to $y^\varepsilon_t(y^\varepsilon_t)^\top$ and noting (4.7), one has

$$\begin{aligned} dY^\varepsilon_t &= \Big\{b_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+Y^\varepsilon_t b_x(t)^\top\Big\}dt+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\Big\{h^{ij}_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+Y^\varepsilon_t h^{ij}_x(t)^\top\Big\}d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t\\ &\quad+\sum_{j=1}^d\Big\{Y^\varepsilon_t\sigma^j_x(t)^\top+\sigma^j_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+[y^\varepsilon_t\delta\sigma^j(t)^\top+\delta\sigma^j(t)(y^\varepsilon_t)^\top]I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big\}dB^j_t\\ &\quad+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\Big\{\sigma^i_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t\sigma^j_x(t)^\top+\sigma^i_x(t)y^\varepsilon_t\delta\sigma^j(t)^\top I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)+\delta\sigma^i(t)(y^\varepsilon_t)^\top\sigma^j_x(t)^\top I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\\ &\quad+\delta\sigma^i(t)\delta\sigma^j(t)^\top I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big\}d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Let $P_T=g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} tr[P_TY^\varepsilon_T] &= tr[P_0Y^\varepsilon_0+\int_0^T P_tdY^\varepsilon_t+\int_0^T Y^\varepsilon_tdP_t+\langle P,Y^\varepsilon\rangle_T]\\ &= tr\Big[\int_0^T\Big(P_tb_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+P_tY^\varepsilon_tb_x(t)^\top\Big)dt+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\int_0^T\Big(P_th^{ij}_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+P_tY^\varepsilon_th^{ij}_x(t)^\top\Big)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t\\ &\quad+\sum_{j=1}^d\int_0^T P_t\Big(Y^\varepsilon_t\sigma^j_x(t)^\top+\sigma^j_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t+(y^\varepsilon_t\delta\sigma^j(t)^\top+\delta\sigma^j(t)(y^\varepsilon_t)^\top)I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big)dB^j_t\\ &\quad+\sum_{i,j=1}^d\int_0^T\Big(P_t\sigma^i_x(t)Y^\varepsilon_t\sigma^j_x(t)^\top+P_t\delta\sigma^i(t)\delta\sigma^j(t)^\top I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)\Big)d\langle B^i,B^j\rangle_t+\int_0^T Y^\varepsilon_tdP_t\\ &\quad+\langle P,Y^\varepsilon\rangle_T\Big]+o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Now we apply the above equality to (5.5). In order to get rid of $Y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ (noting $tr[AB]=tr[BA]$),

we define the second-order adjoint equation as follows:

$$\begin{cases} dP_t = -\Big\{ \Big[b_x(t)^\top P_t + P_t b_x(t) + H_{xx}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t) \Big] dt + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \Big[P_t h_x^{ij}(t) + h_x^{ij}(t)^\top P_t \\ \qquad +\sigma_x^i(t)^\top P_t \sigma_x^j(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(q_t^{ki} \sigma_{xx}^{kj}(t) + p_t^k h_{xx}^{ij,k}(t) \Big) \\ \qquad +\sigma_x^j(t)^\top Q_t^i + Q_t^i \sigma_x^j(t) \Big] d\langle B^i, B^j \rangle_t \Big\} + \sum_{j=1}^{d} Q_t^j dB_t^j, \qquad t \in [0,T], \\ P_T = g_{xx}(\bar{X}_T). \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Where, $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot))$ is the solution to (5.1) and $p^k(\cdot)$ (resp. $q^{ki}(\cdot)$) denotes the k-th component of $p(\cdot)$ (resp. $q^i(\cdot)$). In the above (5.9), the unknown is again a pair of processes $(P(\cdot), Q(\cdot)) \in M_G^2(0,T;S(n)) \times (M_G^2(0,T;S(n)))^d$. Note that equation (5.9) is also a G-BSDE with matrix-valued unknowns. As with (5.1), under assumptions (1)-(3), there exists a unique solution $(P(\cdot), Q(\cdot))$ to (5.9). We refer to $p(\cdot)$ (resp. $P(\cdot)$) as the first-order (resp. second-order) adjoint process. In what follows, if $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot)$ is an optimal (resp. admissible) pair, and $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot))$ and $(P(\cdot), Q(\cdot))$ are solutions of (5.1) and (5.9), respectively, then $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot), p(\cdot), q(\cdot), P(\cdot), Q(\cdot))$ is called an optimal (resp. admissible) 6-tuple.

Then, combining (5.8) and (5.9), and substituting into (5.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \\ \leq\ & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{ \int_0^T \Big[H(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t, p_t) - H(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t) \Big] I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) dt + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \delta h^{ij}(t) \rangle + \langle q_t^i, \delta \sigma^j(t) \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} tr(\delta\sigma^i(t) P_t \delta\sigma^j(t)^\top) \Big] I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) d\langle B^i, B^j \rangle_t \Big\} + o(\varepsilon) \qquad (5.10) \\ =\ & \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{ \int_0^T \Big[H(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t, p_t) - H(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t) + \frac{1}{2} tr(F(t, \bar{X}_t, u_t, p_t, P_t) v_t) \Big] I_{E_\varepsilon}(t) dt \Big\} \qquad (5.11) \\ & + o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Where $v = (v^{ij})$ is symmetrical and defined by (2.8) and $F(t,x,u,p,P) \in S(d)$ with (for all $1 \leq i,j \leq d$)

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ij}(t,x,u,p,P) &= \langle p_t, h^{ij}(t,x,u) - h^{ij}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle + \langle p_t, h^{ji}(t,x,u) - h^{ji}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle \\ &\quad + (q_t^\top (\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})) + (\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}))^\top q_t)_{ij} \\ &\quad + ((\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}))^\top P_t (\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})))_{ij} \qquad (5.12) \\ &= \langle p_t, h^{ij}(t,x,u) - h^{ij}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle + \langle p_t, h^{ji}(t,x,u) - h^{ji}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle q_t^i, \sigma^j(t,x,u) - \sigma^j(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle + \langle \sigma^i(t,x,u) - \sigma^i(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}), q_t^j \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle P_t(\sigma^i(t,x,u) - \sigma^i(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})), \sigma^j(t,x,u) - \sigma^j(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}) \rangle. \qquad (5.13) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the optimality of $\bar{u}(\cdot)$, (5.11) can be written as

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T \Big[H(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t,p_t)-H(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,p_t)+\frac{1}{2}tr(F(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t,p_t,P_t)v_t)\Big]I_{E_\varepsilon}(t)dt\Big\}\geq o(\varepsilon). \quad (5.14)$$

By (2.9), Theorem (2.15) and our assumptions we can easily obtain

$$H(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t,p_t)-H(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,p_t)+G(F(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t,p_t,P_t))\geq 0 \quad \forall u\in\mathcal{U}[0,T], t\in[0,T], q.s.. \quad (5.15)$$

Remark 5.1. Here, we have used $\langle p_t, h^{ij}(t,x,u)-h^{ij}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})\rangle+\langle p_t, h^{ji}(t,x,u)-h^{ji}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})\rangle$ and $(q_t^\top(\sigma(t,x,u)-\sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}))+(\sigma(t,x,u)-\sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}))^\top q_t)_{ij}$ in (5.12) instead of $2\langle p_t, h^{ij}(t,x,u)-h^{ij}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})\rangle$ and $2(q_t^\top(\sigma(t,x,u)-\sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})))_{ij}$, respectively, Because of the fact that G is a function from $S(d)$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and $tr[AB]=tr[A^\top B]$ for any symmetric matrices B.

Consequently, by the above procedure we have the following theorem:

Theorem 5.2. *(Stochastic Maximum Principle) Let assumptions (1)-(3) hold. Let $(\bar{X}(\cdot),\bar{u}(\cdot))$ be an optimal pair of Problem (3.1). Then there are pairs of processes*

$$\begin{cases}(p(\cdot),q(\cdot))\in M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)\times(M_G^2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n))^d,\\ (P(\cdot),Q(\cdot))\in M_G^2(0,T;S(n))\times(M_G^2(0,T;S(n)))^d.\end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

satisfying the first-order and second-order adjoint equations (5.1) and (5.9), respectively, such that the variational inequality (5.15) hold.

Remark 5.3. If we define an $\mathcal{H}$ function by

$$\mathcal{H}(t,x,u)=H(t,x,u,p)+G(F(t,x,u,p,P)) \quad (5.17)$$

Then we can rewrite the maximum principle (5.15) as

$$\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{X}_t,u_t)-\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t)\geq 0, \quad \forall u\in\mathcal{U}[0,T], t\in[0,T], q.s.. \quad (5.18)$$

Or, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t)=\min_{u\in U}\mathcal{H}(t,\bar{X}_t,u), \quad \forall t\in[0,T], q.s.. \quad (5.19)$$

We also call (5.19) the maximum condition similar to the classical case.

6 Sufficient conditions of optimality

In this section we will show that for the controlled stochastic systems (3.1) formulated earlier, the maximum condition in terms of the $\mathcal{H}$ function (see (5.19)) plus some convexity conditions constitute sufficient conditions for optimality.

Let us first introduce an additional assumption.

(4) The control domain $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex.

For each matrix $A \in \Gamma$ (where Γ is defined by Remark 2.5). Then, we set $F^*(t,x,u,p,q) = (F^*_{ij}(t,x,u,p,q))_{1\le i,j\le d}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} F^*_{ij}(t,x,u,p,q) &= \langle p_t, h^{ij}(t,x,u) - h^{ij}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})\rangle + \langle p_t, h^{ji}(t,x,u) - h^{ji}(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})\rangle \\ &\quad + (q_t^\top(\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u})) + (\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,\bar{x},\bar{u}))^\top q_t)_{ij} \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$H^*(t,x,u,p,A) = H(t,x,u,p) + \frac{1}{2}tr[F^*(t,x,u,p,q)A], \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{6.2}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^*(t,x,u,A) = H(t,x,u,p) + \frac{1}{2}tr[F(t,x,u,p,P)A], \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{6.3}$$

The following lemma involves in the so called Clarke's generalized gradient and we refer the reader to Young and Zhou [28] Lemma-III 2.3 for more details. However, it will play an important role in the sequel.

Lemma 6.1. *Let assumptions (1)-(3) and (4) hold. Let $(\bar{X}(\cdot),\bar{u}(\cdot),p(\cdot),q(\cdot),P(\cdot),Q(\cdot))$ be a given admissible 6-tuple. Then*

$$\partial_u H^*(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,p_t,A) = \partial_u \mathcal{H}^*(t,\bar{X}_t,\bar{u}_t,A), \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{6.4}$$

Proof. Fix a $t \in [0,T]$. Define

$$\begin{cases} H^*(u) \triangleq H^*(t,\bar{X}_t,u,p_t,A), \\ \mathcal{H}^*(u) \triangleq \mathcal{H}^*(t,\bar{X}_t,u,A), \\ \sigma(u) \triangleq \sigma(t,\bar{X}_t,u), \\ \psi(u) = \frac{1}{2}tr[\sigma(u)^\top P_t\sigma(u)A] - tr[\sigma(u)^\top P_t\sigma(\bar{u}_t)A] + \frac{1}{2}tr[\sigma(\bar{u}_t)^\top P_t\sigma(\bar{u}_t)A]. \end{cases}$$

Then, by (5.12), (6.1), (6.2) and (6.3), we have

$$\mathcal{H}^*(u) = H^*(u) + \psi(u)$$

Note that for any $r \downarrow 0, u, v \in U$, with $u \to \bar{u}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(u+rv) - \psi(u) &= \frac{1}{2}tr\Big\{[\sigma(u+rv) - \sigma(u)]^\top P_t[\sigma(u+rv) + \sigma(u) - 2\sigma(\bar{u}_t)]A\Big\} \\ &= o(r). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\overline{\lim_{\substack{u\to\bar{u}_t,u\in U\\ r\downarrow 0}}} \frac{\mathcal{H}^*(u+rv) - \mathcal{H}^*(u)}{r} = \overline{\lim_{\substack{u\to\bar{u}_t,u\in U\\ r\downarrow 0}}} \frac{H^*(u+rv) - H^*(u)}{r}.$$

Consequently, by the definition of Clarke's generalized gradient in Young and Zhou [28] Lemma-III 2.3, the desired result follows. □

Now we present the following sufficient conditions of optimality.

Theorem 6.2. *Let assumptions (1)-(3) and (4) hold. Let $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot), p(\cdot), q(\cdot), P(\cdot), Q(\cdot))$ be an admissible 6-tuple. Suppose that $g(\cdot)$ is convex, $H^*(t, \cdot, \cdot, p_t, A)$ is also convex for all $t \in [0, T]$ q.s., and*

$$\mathcal{H}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) = \min_{u \in U} \mathcal{H}(t, \bar{X}_t, u), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], q.s. \tag{6.5}$$

Then $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ is an optimal pair of Problem (3.1).

Proof. By the maximum condition (6.5), for each prior $P \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists a $v_t \in \Gamma$ (see (2.8)) such that

$$\mathcal{H}^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, v_t) = \min_{u \in U} \mathcal{H}^*(t, \bar{X}_t, u, v_t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], q.s. \tag{6.6}$$

From Lemma III-2.3-(iii) in Young and Zhou [28] and Lemma (6.1), we have

$$0 \in \partial_u \mathcal{H}^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, v_t) = \partial_u H^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t) \tag{6.7}$$

Also by Lemma III-2.4 in Young and Zhou [28], we further conclude that

$$(H_x^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t), 0) \in \partial_{x,u} H^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t) \tag{6.8}$$

Thus, by the convexity of $H^*(t, \cdot, \cdot, p_t, v_t)$, one obtains

$$\langle H_x^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t), X_t - \bar{X}_t \rangle \leq H^*(t, X_t, u_t, p_t, v_t) - H^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t) \tag{6.9}$$

For any admissible pair $(X(\cdot), u(\cdot))$. Define $\xi_t \triangleq X_t - \bar{X}_t$, which satisfies the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_t = \Big\{ b_x(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + \alpha_t \Big\} dt + \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{d} \Big\{ h_x^{ij}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + \gamma_t^{ij} \Big\} d\langle B^i, B^j \rangle_t \\ \qquad\quad + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{d} \Big\{ \sigma_x^j(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + \beta_t^j \Big\} dB_t^j, \qquad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \xi_0 = 0, \end{cases} \tag{6.10}$$

where (for $1 \leq i, j \leq d$)

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_t \triangleq -b_x(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + b(t, X_t, u_t) - b(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \\ \gamma_t^{ij} \triangleq -h_x^{ij}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + h^{ij}(t, X_t, u_t) - h^{ij}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \\ \beta_t^j \triangleq -\sigma_x^j(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)\xi_t + \sigma^j(t, X_t, u_t) - \sigma^j(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t). \end{cases}$$

By the convexity of $g(\cdot)$, we have

$$g(\bar{X}_T) - g(X_T) \leq \langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), \bar{X}_T - X_T \rangle. \tag{6.11}$$

Then,combining (6.9), (6.10) and (6.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) - J(u(\cdot)) &= \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\int_0^T f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)dt + g(\bar{X}_T)\Big] - \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\int_0^T f(t, X_t, u_t)dt + g(X_T)\Big] \\
&\leq \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt + g(\bar{X}_T) - g(X_T)\Big\} \\
&\leq \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt - \langle g_x(\bar{X}_T), \xi_T \rangle\Big\} \\
&= \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt - [\langle p_T, \xi_T \rangle - \langle p_0, \xi_0 \rangle]\Big\} \\
&= \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt - \int_0^T \Big[\langle p_t, \alpha_t \rangle + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle p_t, \gamma_t^{ij} v_t^{ij} \rangle \\
&\quad - \langle f_x(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t), \xi_t \rangle + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle q_t^i, \beta_t^j v_t^{ij} \rangle\Big]dt\Big\} \\
&= \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt + \int_0^T \Big[\langle H_x^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t), \xi_t \rangle \\
&\quad - \langle p_t, b(t, X_t, u_t) - b(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle p_t, (h^{ij}(t, X_t, u_t) - h^{ij}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)) v_t^{ij} \rangle \\
&\quad - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle q_t^i, (\sigma^j(t, X_t, u_t) - \sigma^j(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)) v_t^{ij} \rangle\Big]dt\Big\} \\
&\leq \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt + \int_0^T \Big[H_x^*(t, X_t, u_t, p_t, v_t) \\
&\quad - H_x^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t) - \langle p_t, b(t, X_t, u_t) - b(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle p_t, (h^{ij}(t, X_t, u_t) \\
&\quad - h^{ij}(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)) v_t^{ij} \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle q_t^i, (\sigma^j(t, X_t, u_t) - \sigma^j(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)) v_t^{ij} \rangle\Big]dt\Big\} \\
&= \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big\{\int_0^T [f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t) - f(t, X_t, u_t)]dt + \int_0^T [f(t, X_t, u_t) - f(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t)]dt\Big\} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) \leq J(u(\cdot)). \tag{6.12}$$

Since $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ is arbitrary, the desired result follows. □

7 Applications to finance

In this section, we investigate a financial market under model risk caused by uncertain volatilities. Then, we apply our maximum principle (Theorem (5.2)) and the sufficient conditions (Theorem (6.2)) to obtain the optimal control.

Let us now come to the introduction of the financial market. We consider a Black-Scholes like market with uncertain volatilities, i.e., the stock price S is modeled as a geometric G-Brownian motion (see Vorbrink [27])

$$dS_t = \mu S_t dt + S_t dB_t, \quad S_0 > 0. \tag{7.1}$$

where the canonical process $B = (B_t)$ is a one dimensional G-Brownian motion with parameters $\bar{\sigma} \geq \underline{\sigma} > 0$ under G-expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$. Where $\bar{\sigma}^2 = \hat{\mathbb{E}}[B_1^2]$ and $\underline{\sigma}^2 = -\hat{\mathbb{E}}[-B_1^2]$.

In this market, there also consists of a risk-less bond with price P is given by

$$dP_t = rP_t dt, \quad P_0 > 0. \tag{7.2}$$

Here r and μ are constants with $\mu > r$.

Let u_t denotes the total market value of the investor's wealth invested in the stock which we call portfolio. Given the initial wealth $X_0 = x \geq 0$, combining (7.1) and (7.2), we can get the following wealth dynamics:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = [rX_t + (\mu - r)u_t]dt + u_t dB_t, \quad t \geq 0, \\ X_0 = x. \end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

Next, we discuss a mean-variance portfolio optimization problem. That is the investor's object is to find an admissible portfolio $\bar{u}_t$ which minimizes the variance $Var(X_T) := E[X_T - (EX_T)^2]$ at some future time $T > 0$ under the condition that $EX_T = A$ for some given $A \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the lagrange multiplier method, we know that it is equivalent to study the following problem:

$$\inf_{u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]} E\Big[\frac{1}{2}(X_T - a)^2\Big], \tag{7.4}$$

where some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is given.

In this paper, we consider a pessimistic investor with conservative attitude on Knightian uncertainty. Thus, our object functional with multiple-priors $\mathcal{P}$ is as follows:

$$J(u(\cdot)) := \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} E_P\Big[\frac{1}{2}(X_T - a)^2\Big] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}\Big[\frac{1}{2}(X_T - a)^2\Big]. \tag{7.5}$$

and our portfolio optimization problem is to find a $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ such that

$$J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}[0,T]} J(u(\cdot)). \tag{7.6}$$

In other words, we want to minimize the maximum risk.

Suppose $(\bar{X}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ is an optimal pair (which we are going to identify). Then the corresponding adjoint equations are

$$\begin{cases} dp_t = -rp_t dt + q_t dB_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \\ p_T = \bar{X}_T - a, \end{cases} \tag{7.7}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dP_t = -2rP_t dt + Q_t dB_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \\ P_T = 1. \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

Clearly, $(P_t, Q_t) = (e^{2r(T-t)}, 0)$ is the only solution to (7.8). The corresponding $\mathcal{H}$-function is

$$\mathcal{H}(t, \bar{X}_t, u) = p_t(r\bar{X}_t + (\mu - r)u) + G(2q_t(u - \bar{u}_t) + e^{2r(T-t)}(u - \bar{u}_t)^2). \tag{7.9}$$

Then, by (2.3), there exists a $\Lambda \in \Gamma = [\underline{\sigma}^2, \bar{\sigma}^2]$ such that

$$G(2q_t(u - \bar{u}_t) + e^{2r(T-t)}(u - \bar{u}_t)^2) = \frac{1}{2}\Lambda(2q_t(u - \bar{u}_t) + e^{2r(T-t)}(u - \bar{u}_t)^2). \tag{7.10}$$

Note that the above is a convex function of u, so by Theorem (5.2), a necessary condition for $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ to be optimal is

$$p_t(\mu - r) + q_t\Lambda = 0. \tag{7.11}$$

Due to the terminal condition of (7.7), we try a process $p(\cdot)$ of the form

$$p_t = \phi_t \bar{X}_t + \psi_t. \tag{7.12}$$

where ϕ_t, ψ_t are deterministic differentiable functions. Applying G-*Itô* formula to (7.12), we have

$$dp_t = [(\dot{\phi}_t + r\phi_t)\bar{X}_t + \phi_t(\mu - r)\bar{u}_t + \dot{\psi}_t]dt + \phi_t \bar{u}_t dB_t. \tag{7.13}$$

Combining (7.7), (7.11) and (7.13), we get

$$\begin{cases} (\dot{\phi}_t + r\phi_t)\bar{X}_t + \phi_t(\mu - r)\bar{u}_t + \dot{\psi}_t = -r(\phi_t \bar{X}_t + \psi_t), \\ \phi_t \bar{u}_t = \frac{r-\mu}{\Lambda} p_t = \frac{r-\mu}{\Lambda}(\phi_t \bar{X}_t + \psi_t). \end{cases} \tag{7.14}$$

By the first equation of (7.14), we get

$$\bar{u}_t = \frac{(\dot{\phi}_t + 2r\phi_t)\bar{X}_t + r\psi_t + \dot{\psi}_t}{\phi_t(r - \mu)}. \tag{7.15}$$

and by the second equation, we get

$$\bar{u}_t = \frac{r - \mu}{\Lambda}\bar{X}_t + \frac{(r - \mu)\psi_t}{\Lambda\phi_t}. \tag{7.16}$$

Combining (7.15) and (7.16) (noting the terminal condition in (7.7)), we can easily obtain

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\phi}_t = [\frac{(r-\mu)^2}{\Lambda} - 2r]\phi_t, \quad \phi_T = 1, \\ \dot{\psi}_t = [\frac{(r-\mu)^2}{\Lambda} - r]\psi_t, \quad \psi_T = -a. \end{cases} \tag{7.17}$$

The solutions to these equations are

$$\begin{cases} \phi_t = e^{(2r - \frac{(r-\mu)^2}{\Lambda})(T-t)}, \\ \psi_t = -ae^{(r - \frac{(r-\mu)^2}{\Lambda})(T-t)}. \end{cases} \tag{7.18}$$

With this choice of ϕ_t and ψ_t, we have a candidate for the optimal control given by (7.15) or (7.16). In order to see that this choice of $\bar{u}_t$ is indeed optimal, let us calculate

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(t, \bar{X}_t, \bar{u}_t, p_t, v_t) &= p_t(r\bar{X}_t + (\mu - r)u) + q_t v_t(u - \bar{u}_t) \\ &= (\phi_t \bar{X}_t + \psi_t)(r\bar{X}_t + (\mu - r)u) + \frac{r-\mu}{\Lambda}(\phi_t \bar{X}_t + \psi_t)v_t(u - \bar{u}_t). \end{aligned}$$

which is convex in (x, u). Moreover, $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x - a)^2$ is also convex. So the optimality follows from Theorem (6.2). Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *The optimal solution $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ of our portfolio optimization problem with uncertain volatilities (7.6), when the wealth dynamics obeys (7.3), is given in the state feedback form by (7.15) or (7.16), for $t \in [0, T]$, where ϕ_t, ψ_t are given by (7.18).*

In the above formula (7.15) or (7.16), since Γ reflects an investor's uncertainty on the financial environment which causes the multiple-priors $\mathcal{P}$. So, the investor's optimal portfolio decision with pessimism is based on the factor Λ. This illustrative example shows the effect of an investor's Knightian uncertainty on optimal portfolio strategy.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a general framework in order to deal with model risk caused by volatility uncertainty. The G-framework summarized in Peng [25] gives us a meaningful and appropriate setting. Then, both necessary and sufficient maximum principles for optimal control of stochastic system under Knightian uncertainty are proved. The result is applied to a mean-variance portfolio selection optimization problem and explicit expression of the optimal strategy is obtained with a uncertain factor.

References

[1] Ravi Bansal, Dana Kiku, Ivan Shaliastovich, and Amir Yaron. Volatility, the macroeconomy and asset prices. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.

[2] Tim Bollerslev, Natalia Sizova, and George Tauchen. Volatility in equilibrium: Asymmetries and dynamic dependencies. *Review of Finance*, 16(1):31–80, 2012.

[3] John Y Campbell, Stefano Giglio, Christopher Polk, and Robert Turley. An intertemporal capm with stochastic volatility. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.

[4] Zengjing Chen and Larry Epstein. Ambiguity, risk, and asset returns in continuous time. *Econometrica*, 70(4):1403–1443, 2002.

[5] Xue Cheng and Frank Riedel. Optimal stopping under ambiguity in continuous time. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 7(1):29–68, 2013.

[6] Laurent Denis, Mingshang Hu, and Shige Peng. Function spaces and capacity related to a sublinear expectation: application to G-Brownian motion paths. *Potential Analysis*, 34(2): 139–161, 2011.

[7] Itamar Drechsler. Uncertainty, time-varying fear, and asset prices. *The Journal of Finance*, page 1843?1889, 2013.

[8] Daniel Ellsberg. Risk, ambiguity, and the savage axioms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pages 643–669, 1961.

[9] Larry Epstein and Shaolin Ji. Ambiguous volatility, possibility and utility in continuous time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.1652*, 2011.

[10] Larry G Epstein and Shaolin Ji. Ambiguous volatility and asset pricing in continuous time. *Review of Financial Studies*, 26(7):1740–1786, 2013.

[11] Larry G Epstein and Martin Schneider. Recursive multiple-priors. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 113(1):1–31, 2003.

[12] Weiyin Fei. Optimal consumption and portfolio choice with ambiguity and anticipation. *Information Sciences*, 177(23):5178–5190, 2007.

[13] Weiyin Fei and Chen Fei. Optimal stochastic control and optimal consumption and portfolio with G-Brownian motion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.0209*, 2013.

[14] Itzhak Gilboa and David Schmeidler. Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. *Journal of mathematical economics*, 18(2):141–153, 1989.

[15] L Hansen, T Sargent, and G Turmuhambetova. N. williams (2006):robust control, min-max expected utility and model misspecification. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 128:45–90, 2006.

[16] Ming-shang Hu and Shi-ge Peng. On representation theorem of G-expectations and paths of G-Brownian motion. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica, English Series*, 25(3):539–546, 2009.

[17] Mingshang Hu, Shaolin Ji, Shige Peng, and Yongsheng Song. Backward stochastic differential equations driven by G-Brownian motion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.5889*, 2012.

[18] Mingshang Hu, Shaolin Ji, and Shuzhen Yang. A stochastic recursive optimal control problem under the G-expectation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.1312*, 2013.

[19] H Knight Frank. Risk, uncertainty, and profit. *Houghton Mifflin*, 1921.

[20] Xinpeng Li and Shige Peng. Stopping times and related Itôs calculus with G-Brownian motion. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 121(7):1492–1508, 2011.

[21] Shige Peng. A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*, 28(4):966–979, 1990.

[22] Shige Peng. G-Brownian motion and dynamic risk measure under volatility uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0711.2834*, 2007.

[23] Shige Peng. G-expectation,G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus of Itô type. In *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, pages 541–567. Springer, 2007.

[24] Shige Peng. Multi-dimensional G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus under G-expectation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 118(12):2223–2253, 2008.

[25] Shige Peng. Nonlinear expectations and stochastic calculus under uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1002.4546*, 2010.

[26] H Mete Soner, Nizar Touzi, and Jianfeng Zhang. Wellposedness of second order backward sdes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 153(1-2):149–190, 2012.

[27] Jörg Vorbrink. Financial markets with volatility uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.1535*, 2010.

[28] Jiongmin Young and Xun Yu Zhou. *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, volume 43. Springer, 1999.

[29] Defei Zhang. Stochastic optimal control problems under G-expectation. *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, 34(1):96–110, 2013.

[30] Xin Zhang and Tak Kuen Siu. Optimal investment and reinsurance of an insurer with model uncertainty. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 45(1):81–88, 2009.